

NOTICE: THIS DECISION DOES NOT CREATE LEGAL PRECEDENT  
AND MAY NOT BE CITED EXCEPT AS AUTHORIZED BY APPLICABLE  
RULES. See Ariz. R. Supreme Court 111(c); ARCAP 28(c); Ariz. R. Crim. P. 31.24.

FILED BY CLERK

SEP 14 2009

COURT OF APPEALS  
DIVISION TWO

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS  
STATE OF ARIZONA  
DIVISION TWO

THE STATE OF ARIZONA,	)	
	)	
Appellee,	)	2 CA-CR 2008-0428
	)	DEPARTMENT A
v.	)	
	)	<u>MEMORANDUM DECISION</u>
	)	Not for Publication
ARTURO SANCHEZ-NARANJO,	)	Rule 111, Rules of
	)	the Supreme Court
Appellant.	)	
_____	)	

APPEAL FROM THE SUPERIOR COURT OF GILA COUNTY

Cause No. CR20080200

Honorable Robert Duber II, Judge

AFFIRMED

Emily Danies

Tucson  
Attorney for Appellant

E S P I N O S A, Presiding Judge.

¶1 Appellant Arturo Sanchez-Naranjo was convicted after a jury trial of possession of a dangerous drug for sale in a quantity above the threshold amount and possession of drug paraphernalia for sale. By interrogatory, the jury found the quantity of cocaine he possessed to be approximately fifty pounds, with a value of over one million

dollars. After considering aggravating and mitigating circumstances, the trial court sentenced Sanchez-Naranjo to aggravated, concurrent terms of imprisonment, the longer of which was seven years.

¶2 Counsel has filed a brief in compliance with *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), and *State v. Clark*, 196 Ariz. 530, 2 P.3d 89 (App. 1999), avowing she has reviewed the entire record and found no arguable issue to raise on appeal. In compliance with *Clark*, counsel has provided “a detailed factual and procedural history of the case with citations to the record, [so] this court can satisfy itself that counsel has in fact thoroughly reviewed the record.” 196 Ariz. 530, ¶ 32, 2 P.3d at 97. Sanchez-Naranjo has not filed a supplemental brief.

¶3 Pursuant to our obligation under *Anders*, we have reviewed the record in its entirety and are satisfied it supports counsel’s recitation of the facts. Viewed in the light most favorable to upholding the jury’s verdicts, *see State v. Tamplin*, 195 Ariz. 246, ¶ 2, 986 P.2d 914, 914 (App. 1999), the evidence established that an officer with the Arizona Department of Public Safety had stopped Sanchez-Naranjo for speeding when he observed multiple cellular telephones and air fresheners in his vehicle. The officer recognized these items as a possible indication the driver was transporting contraband and asked Sanchez-Naranjo for permission to search the vehicle. Sanchez-Naranjo agreed and signed a consent to search form printed in both English and Spanish. A thorough search of the vehicle revealed hidden compartments containing twenty packages of cocaine, each weighing

approximately 2.5 pounds. The commander of the Gila County Narcotics Task Force opined the recovered cocaine was worth over one million dollars.

¶4 Substantial evidence supported findings of all the elements necessary for Sanchez-Naranjo's convictions, *see* A.R.S. §§ 13-3401(36)(b); 13-3408(A)(2), (B)(2), (D); 13-3415(B), and his sentences are well within the authorized ranges. A.R.S. §§ 13-701(D)(24); 13-702(A), (D).<sup>1</sup> In our examination of the record pursuant to *Anders*, we have found no reversible error and no arguable issue warranting further appellate review. *See Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744. We therefore affirm Sanchez-Naranjo's convictions and sentences.

---

PHILIP G. ESPINOSA, Presiding Judge

CONCURRING:

---

JOSEPH W. HOWARD, Chief Judge

---

J. WILLIAM BRAMMER, JR., Judge

---

<sup>1</sup>Significant portions of the Arizona criminal sentencing code have been renumbered, effective December 31, 2008. *See* 2008 Ariz. Sess. Laws, ch. 301, §§ 1-120. For ease of reference and because the renumbering included no substantive changes relevant to this case, *see* 2008 Ariz. Sess. Laws, ch. 301, § 119, we refer in this decision to the current section numbers rather than those in effect at the time of the offense.